

# MEMO

LONG RANGE PLANNING

**TO:** Plan Review Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Long Range Planning Staff  
**DATE:** February 20, 2003  
**SUBJECT:** Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of  
February 19, 2003 (Meeting #32)

**Attendance:**

Steering Committee Members:

Jay Cerveny	City of La Center Council Member
Bill Ganley	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufelt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Jeannie Stewart	City of Vancouver Council Member

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
Kathy Folkers	Lane Powell Spears Lubersky
Ken Hadley	Self
Richard Howsley	Lane Powell Spears Lubersky
Laura Hudson	David Evans & Associates
Joe Lear	Windsong Acres Homeowners Association
John McConnaughey	WSDOT, SW Region
Tim McMahan	Stoel Rives Law Firm
Ken Navidi	Hazel Dell Sewer District
Matt Lewis	BIASW
Richard Price	Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association
Randy Printz	Landerholm Law Firm
Janet Rogerson	CTED
George Vartanian	Self & Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association
Ellen Wax	David Evans & Associates

Staff:

Monty Anderson	City of Washougal Planning Director
Rich Carson	Clark County Community Development Director
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning

Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rich Lowry	Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Dale Miller	C-TRAN Development and Technical Services Director
Dennis Osburn	City of Battle Ground Planning Director
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planning Director
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner
Josh Warner	Clark County Community Development

## 1. Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves.

## 2. Review January 15, 2003 meeting notes

Accepted as sent out.

## 3. Focused Public Investment Areas (FPIA) project status

Hudson (David Evans & Associates) gave a presentation on FPIA. See handout for specific information. Seventeen investment areas have been identified for study. These are listed in the spreadsheet handed out with the presentation materials. The final report will give details on existing land uses, infrastructure, job capacity, etc. The timeline is to have the report out 6 weeks from now.

## 4. Draft EIS (DEIS) general comments

Lee presented. The DEIS is close to being issued in draft form. Outstanding issues include:

- summary matrix of impacts and mitigation measures;
- GMA conformance section indicating progress the County and the Cities have made responding to changes in state law since adoption of the existing comprehensive plans;
- revenue projections for the capital facilities analysis;
- transportation system costs by alternative;
- Vancouver is doing additional modeling for Alternative 3A, the alternative that includes light rail extensions per the I-5 Partnership Study recommendations;
- Map of land use/zone change requests submitted by individual property owners and a summary narrative addressing how they conform to the various alternatives;
- Analysis of stormwater data.

The DEIS should be issued by mid-march with a 45 day public review period. A marked-up copy of the comprehensive plan text will be available for review simultaneous with the DEIS. The preferred alternative would be picked by mid to late May and open houses will be held in June. Revisions to the preferred alternative and development of a final EIS would occur during the summer with Planning Commission hearings commencing by mid-August.

Deleted: ¶

## 5. TAC update

Higbie presented. TAC discussed this issue last week, and are in general agreement, that an Urban Holding designation should be considered by all the Cities and Clark County for land that is added to urban growth areas as a part of the plan update.

Urban Holding is basically a zoning overlay that was used extensively in 1994 to apply to most of the urban area expansions around the cities where it was clear that planning for public facilities was inadequate at the time the plan was adopted. It was applied to areas around all of the cities in Clark County and an area north of Salmon Creek.

Deleted: ¶

Urban Holding basically limits the land to 10-acre minimum lot sizes for areas intended for residential and 20 acres for areas designated for industrial uses. The allowed uses in Urban Holding zones are basically rural residential, with some conditional uses such as schools and churches. The zone was applied to areas known to have some unresolved development issue that, once solved, allowed the designation to be lifted and the underlying urban zoning take effect.

Deleted: ¶

The benefits of applying Urban Holding to many newly added urban areas include providing the jurisdictions with additional time to more specifically address the identified problems or obstacles to urban development.

Problems in different areas might be, Where will the arterial streets actually be located and developed? Is the location of the urban zoning adopted through the plan update truly reflective of what the community wants? Where should sewer and water facilities be located? Do school districts need time to identify where school facilities should be located? Do cities want other urban transition tools to help phase growth into new areas? Does the specific city currently have adequate public sewer and water, or do there capital facilities plans say they will be on line some years down the planning period?

Snodgrass said the one purpose of the urban holding type zoning is to delay or phase development of those lands so they do not developed intensely immediately. In 1994 little of this was used for Vancouver. Pridemore asked about the specific language. Higbie responded that exact language was not specifically discussed in the TAC meeting. Kufeldt-Antle asked if the language would prohibit development for a period of time to allow for phasing of growth rather than immediately removing the urban holding as soon as the identified problem is resolved. Higbie responded yes this could be another way of guiding urban development but is beyond the current way urban holding has been applied, but it could go there if the cities wanted to pursue it. Urban Holding has been applied outside of City Limits in the past. The 1994 tool was pretty basic in nature and it could be

more detailed if desired. Lee added that the limitations to UH zoned areas as now applied have been limited to transportation, water or sewer service limitations. Stewart asked about the strikeout in the draft. Higbie said it went to the Board as an informational item. Lee added this will be available with the DEIS review, except for things that are alternative map specific that can't be done until a preferred alternative is determined.

## **6. Other**

Ganley presented a letter from Vancouver, Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield and Yacolt opposing the Discovery Corridor option. The letter was handed out to the steering committee. The other two cities were contacted and did not choose to sign the letter ~~at this time~~.

## **7. Next meeting date and time**

A meeting is tentatively set for March. The April meeting may be at Clark County's new Public Service Center.

## **8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - February 19 2003 (#32).doc